DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 463 267 SP 040 564

AUTHOR	Dean, Ceri B.
TITLE	State Policy Support for Professional Development in the Central Region.
INSTITUTION	Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning, Aurora, CO.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	2001-12-26
NOTE	49p.
CONTRACT	ED-01-CO-0006
AVAILABLE FROM	Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning, 2550 South Parker Road, Suite 500, Aurora, CO 80014-1678. Tel: 303-337-0990; Fax: 303-337-3005; Web site: http://www.mcrel.org.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Finance; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Development; Financial Support; Policy Formation; Teacher Improvement
IDENTIFIERS	Colorado; Kansas; Missouri; Nebraska; North Dakota; South Dakota; *State Policy; Wyoming

ABSTRACT

This study identified policies to increase states' role in teacher professional development in Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming. It examined which elements defined each state's professional development policy and the extent to which policies were consistent with research on effective professional development policies and recommendations from national education organizations. Researchers reviewed key documents from each state and interviewed state education agency staff with primary responsibility for professional development. These states have taken various policy actions to support professional development, attempting to send the message that the overriding purpose of professional development is to improve student achievement. Most states emphasize examining the impact of professional development, though they find it difficult to make decisions about which data to collect and how to collect them without placing unreasonable burdens on the system. All of the states need to examine their policies regarding professional development funding. Most states report that policymakers need to understand the context in which educators teach and become familiar with models of high quality professional development in order to make good professional development policy decisions. Five appendixes present: document and interview protocols; Wyoming Department of Education accreditation rubrics; excerpt from Nebraska State Development Policy; Missouri school improvement process; and Kansas continuum of effective results-based staff development practices. (Contains 21 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original document.

ED 463 267

Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning

State Policy Support for Professional Development in the Central Region

Regional Educational Laboratory
Contract #ED-01-CO-0006
Deliverable #2001-06

Office of Educational Research and Improvement
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20208

prepared by
Ceri B. Dean, Ph.D.

Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning
2550 S. Parker Road, Suite 500
Aurora, CO 80014
303-337-0990 (phone)
303-337-3005 (fax)
www.mcrel.org

December 26, 2001

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Louis Cicchinelli

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP040564

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

© 2001 McREL

This document has been funded at least in part with Federal funds from the U.S. Department of Education under contract number ED-01-CO-0006. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Education nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsements by the U.S. Government.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY i
- Regulatory Policies i
- Funding Policies i
- Programmatic Policies ii
- Comparison of Central Region State Policies to Expert Recommendations iii
- Conclusion iii

INTRODUCTION 1
- Background 1

FINDINGS 3
- Regulatory Policies 3
  - Induction and Mentoring 6
  - Designated Time for Professional Development 6
  - Other Guidance for Professional Development 6
  - Evaluation 8
- Funding Policies 10
  - Intermediate Agencies Involvement 10
  - Direct District and School Support 11
  - Use of Federal Funds 11
  - Other Funding Sources 12
- Programmatic Policies 14
  - State Education Agency Support 14
  - Statewide Initiatives 17
  - State Department Relationships with Other Education Organizations 18

COMPARISON OF CENTRAL REGION STATE POLICIES TO EXPERT RECOMMENDATIONS 19

CONCLUSION 22

REFERENCES 25

APPENDIX A Document and Interview Protocols

APPENDIX B Wyoming Department of Education Accreditation Rubrics

APPENDIX C Excerpt from Nebraska State Development Policy

APPENDIX D Missouri School Improvement Process -- Standard 6.7

APPENDIX E Kansas Continuum of Effective Results-Based Staff Development Practices

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

States have taken a variety of actions to encourage or assist districts' implementation of standards (Massell, 1998) and to improve teacher quality. Among these actions has been the enactment of policies related to professional development. The purpose of this study is to identify professional development policies in the Central Region states and to compare them to policies recommended by education researchers and national professional development organizations. The study findings are organized into three categories: (1) regulatory policies, (2) funding policies, and (3) programmatic policies. Information from this study can help policymakers develop better policies by increasing their awareness of the gap between "ideal" policies and existing policies in their states and by providing examples of how other states have addressed professional development needs through policy.

Regulatory Policies

Certification regulations are the most common regulatory policies in the seven Central Region states. All the Central Region states are among the 35 in the country that require at least some professional development for recertification. However, the requirements for professional development are based primarily on number of clock hours with little guidance about the content of the required professional development. Through their accreditation process, a few states exert an indirect influence on the professional development in which teachers participate by requiring teachers to develop individual professional development plans that are tied to their school's improvement goals. Other regulatory policies relate to induction and mentoring programs, designated time for professional development, standards for professional development, and evaluation of professional development. Only two states require induction or mentoring programs and two others require districts to provide a specified number of hours or days of professional development.

In general, there are few requirements for evaluation and those that exist primarily assess perceived usefulness. Some states are beginning to focus on the link between professional development and student learning through their accreditation process and grant requirements.

Funding Policies

Most of the Central Region states provide funding for state-level and district-level professional development activities. Most of the states provide some funding through grants or appropriations. Those states that rely primarily on federal grants and programs to fund statewide projects provide few, if any, funds directly to districts.

States take different approaches to distributing money to individual districts for district-level professional development. Kansas provides partial reimbursement. Missouri allocates one percent of state aid funds for education is distributed to districts for professional development. Wyoming districts receive $100 per child to spend on professional development, but there is no requirement that the funds be spent on professional development. Nebraska, Missouri, and North Dakota appropriate and distribute money to intermediate service agencies.

The legislature provides funds for special statewide projects or grants to districts and schools in some states. Examples are the statewide reading initiative for K–3 teachers in South Dakota and Teacher Development grants in Colorado. All of the states use discretionary federal funds (Title I, Title II, Goals 2000) to support state-level professional development activities. They also use federal National Board for Professional Teaching Standards subsidy funds to support teachers who are seeking National Board Certification. All Central Region states aggressively pursue federal and private grant opportunities.

Programmatic Policies

Programmatic policies for professional development are related to structures such as offices or divisions within the state department of education that have responsibility for state-sponsored professional development programs and relationships with other organizations interested in professional development.

Several of the states have at least one person who has "professional development" as part of his or her official title, and two states (Missouri and Nebraska) have designated professional development "units." Staff in several state departments of education reported that teams in their departments are beginning to work together to discuss common issues related to professional development, plan activities, and use funds more efficiently.

Most of the states in the Central Region have an intermediate service agency system that is involved in professional development to some extent. Intermediate service agencies in Kansas are funded by fees for services; those in Nebraska, Missouri, Colorado, and North Dakota are funded by state and/or federal funds. North Dakota's intermediate service agencies, Teacher Learning Centers, serve primarily as clearinghouses for curriculum materials and brokers for, rather than providers of, professional development.

Each state has a number of initiatives that contribute to teachers' professional growth. These range from content-area workshops to statewide reading initiatives, assessment institutes, technology projects, teacher leader projects, principal and superintendent academies, professional development and/or school improvement conferences and workshops, and grants to districts to work on standards implementation. State department of education staff often work with intermediate service agency staff on workshops, institutes, and other projects.

Four of the Central Region states (Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, and Wyoming) have staff development organizations that are affiliates of the National Staff Development Council. In five states, district and state education policy and practice are guided in part by councils or coalitions of people interested in professional development.

Comparison of Central Region State Policies to Expert Recommendations

When compared to recommendations from several policy and professional development experts, there is clearly room for improvement in education policy to support professional development in the Central Region states. Although some individual policies are strong, such as funding for state-level activities in Missouri or strong accreditation policies that require results-based staff development in Kansas, no state has a comprehensive set of strong policies that address the full range of key issues related to quality professional development systems.

Although most of the Central Region states have developed professional development guidelines for districts that embody the NSDC standards, none of the states has officially adopted professional development standards. Only two Central Region states require new teacher induction programs; a few states require individual professional development plans that are tied to school improvement goals; and most states require only that credits relate to pedagogy or the content area in which the teacher is certified. Although Central Region states fund professional development at the state and district levels in a variety of ways and to different degrees, the funding may have to be increased to accommodate districts' demands for more on-site assistance.

Conclusion

Central Region states have taken a variety of policy actions to support professional development. Most important, they are trying to send the message that the overriding purpose of professional development is to improve student achievement. The push in most of the Central Region states is toward looking at the impact of professional development. However, states are finding that it is no easy task to make decisions about which data to collect and how to collect these data without placing unreasonable burdens on the system. Although several states indicated that state policies, particularly those related to accreditation and school improvement, are showing an increased alignment with the stated purpose, most states acknowledged that there is room for improvement.

All states in the region need to examine their policies related to funding of professional development. Consistent and adequate funding is needed at the state and district level to support the message that professional development is important and to provide teachers with the time they need to learn, individually and with their colleagues.

Interviewees from almost every state responded that policymakers need to understand the context in which teachers teach and become familiar with models of high-quality professional development in order to make good professional development policy decisions. They need to understand the connection between professional development and student achievement and how professional development fits into the school improvement process. Policymakers, parents, and the community need evidence that professional development is valuable and that it influences student achievement.

Although Central Region states may not be tackling the issue of professional development policy "head-on," neither are they turning their backs on it. Some states are rethinking their policies, and others have made significant progress in improving the quality of their professional development policies by providing financial and philosophical support.

INTRODUCTION

The standards movement, with its emphasis on accountability, has raised concerns about teacher quality and encouraged some states to increase their role in professional development by developing a variety of policies. The intent of this study was to identify such policies in the Central Region states of Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming.

Two main questions guided the study: (1) What elements define each state's professional development policy? and (2) To what extent are the policies of the Central Region states consistent with research on effective professional development policies and recommendations from national education organizations? Key documents from each state were reviewed and state education agency staff with primary responsibility for professional development were interviewed. The number of people interviewed (from one to four people) reflects the distribution of responsibility for professional development within each state's education agency, the extent of the state's role in professional development, and the amount of information available from documentation and the key informant in the state education agency.

The findings in this report include a summary of Central Region state policies and comparisons to policies recommended by education researchers and national organizations. For the purposes of this study, *teacher professional development* refers to opportunities for professional learning for P–12 teachers and *state policy for teacher professional development* refers to the following:

- Regulatory policies — laws, regulations, recommendations, positions, and standards
- Financial policies — grants and appropriations
- Programmatic policies — programs, offices/divisions, activities, initiatives, organizations, and entities

Document review and interview questions addressed each of these areas. There were also several questions that probed for perceptions about who influences professional development policy, how well policies support the stated purpose for professional development, and what information policymakers need to make good decisions about professional development policy. (See Appendix A.)

BACKGROUND

For the last half-century, professional development has been primarily under the control of universities and professional organizations (Ward, St. John, & Laine, 1999). As the standards movement has progressed, states have taken a variety of actions to encourage or assist districts' implementation of standards (Massell, 1998). Among these actions is the enactment of policies related to professional development. States have used policy as a tool to support standards implementation because policy can influence practice in a number of ways: (1) introducing, popularizing, or validating ideas that shape conversations or perceptions; (2) legitimizing and empowering groups of people, such as teachers, whose philosophies are compatible with the direction of the policy; (3) adding or subtracting requirements or linking one set of requirements to another; and (4) providing funds, materials, equipment, or opportunities for technical

assistance (Knapp, 1997). Examples of such policies include writing professional development requirements into laws related to standards-based education reform, changing or creating requirements for renewal of certification, allocating resources for scholarships for participation in master's degree programs in critical shortage areas, and passing regulations that increase the time teachers have available to participate in professional development (e.g., requiring districts to set aside a certain number of days in the calendar for teachers to participate in professional development or a certain number of hours each week for instructional planning and preparation) (Hirsch, Koppich, & Knapp, 2001).

As these examples illustrate, some states have made progress in supporting professional development. Unfortunately, it's a different story in other states. As Hirsch, Koppich, and Knapp (2001) explain, advocates for professional development in many states find it difficult to convince policymakers — and the public — to provide sustained support for professional development. Some policymakers and members of the public are not certain about the need for professional development, believing that teachers know all they need to know as a result of their teacher preparation programs. Others aren't sure about the purpose of professional development or if the outcomes are worth the investment. Still others think that sufficient funds are already available from a variety of federal sources such as Title I, Title II, and Technology Challenge Grants. Many may not be aware that the standards movement has ushered in a new set of challenges and expectations for teachers, which will require them to learn new content and teaching methods.

Traditional professional development practices may contribute to policymakers' perceptions that professional development is not a good mechanism for bringing about desired improvements in student learning. In many districts, teachers choose their professional development from an array of workshops (most often one-shot) or special courses offered by the district. There may also be designated district in-service days devoted to general topics. Some teachers may choose to take university courses that primarily focus on theory rather than application. These types of professional development experiences are quite likely to be disconnected from the problems of practice that teachers face every day in their classrooms. Although teachers may gain new skills as a result of these workshops and courses, these experiences will not transform their practice in the ways needed to teach effectively in a standards-based system (Stein, Smith, & Silver, 1999).

It is not surprising, then, that many policymakers have a limited view of what professional development is and can do. Organizations, such as the National Staff Development Council (NSDC), are working to help teachers, the public, and policymakers understand a new vision of staff development — a vision that includes powerful professional development that improves teacher practice and student learning. This new vision reflects a number of shifts in how professional development is planned, designed, delivered, and evaluated (Sparks & Hirsh, 1997). Examples of these shifts include a change from district-focused to school-focused approaches and from a focus on adults' needs and satisfaction to a focus on students' needs and learning outcomes.

The new vision also includes development of "communities of practice" where teachers assume leadership roles and work with colleagues to explain, challenge, and critique one another's work (Stein et al., 1999). Professional development, in the new vision, provides teachers with opportunities to engage as learners in the discipline by solving content-area problems (e.g.,

writing a story, debating a political issue) and to receive assistance through co-teaching, coaching, or reflecting on actual lessons.

Under the new vision, there are a variety of ways for teachers to learn in addition to the traditional approach of taking courses. These include participation in curriculum development, study groups, action research, and professional networks, as well as observation of master teachers.

The research literature and commentaries from national education organizations and experts (Education Commission of the States, 1997; Massell, 1998; Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; St. John, Ward, & Laine, 1999; Sparks & Hirsch, 2000; Renyi, 1996) indicate that state policies related to teacher professional development have the potential for encouraging teacher learning. The remainder of this report provides information about current professional development policies in the Central Region, highlighting ways in which the policies are in line with recommendations from research and experts. Some states have been slow to enact professional development policies because teacher professional development generally is viewed as a local issue. One purpose for this report is to provide information to policymakers that will prompt them to rethink how they can honor local control while promoting professional development that improves teacher practice and student learning.

FINDINGS

REGULATORY POLICIES

This section summarizes how Central Region states regulate professional development through laws, regulations, recommendations, and standards. Regulatory policies can send explicit messages to districts, schools, and teachers about the importance and appropriate forms of professional development as well as its relationship to improved student learning. The extent to which such messages are sent by Central Region states varies since some states have more or stronger regulatory policies than others.

Certification

One important type of regulatory policy is certification requirements. Across the nation, 35 states mandate professional development for teacher certificate renewal. All seven of the Central Region states are among those 35. Although on the surface this seems promising, the power of this policy is not realized because in many cases states only mandate "clock hours," not specific content, quality, or duration of the professional development. As Hirsch et al. (2001) note, many of the clock-hour experiences may not be directly related to what teachers need to know to help their particular students or of the quality and duration needed to affect teachers' practice or students' learning. As a result, school districts tend to rely on one-time, in-service and workshop models rather than on intensive, ongoing professional development.

States in the Central Region base renewal of teacher certification specifically on clock hours, or express requirements in the form of credit hours or points. Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming state their requirements for renewal of certification in credit hours. Colorado and Missouri state theirs in clock hours, while Kansas states its requirement in terms of

points. States that allow district or state in-service workshops to count for recertification provide a conversion factor for clock hours to credit hours or points. For example, in Kansas one credit hour equals 20 points; in Wyoming, 14 hours of "seat time" equals 1 credit hour. Some states have other requirements, such as years of teaching experience (Nebraska, Missouri) or participation in performance-based teacher evaluation (Missouri), in addition to clock hours.

The number of required hours or points varies by state and, in the case of Kansas, by level of education. To be recertified in Kansas, teachers who hold bachelor's degrees must earn 160 points; those with advanced degrees must earn 120 points. Most states have a five-year renewal period. Exceptions are Missouri and Nebraska, which have different renewal periods for different types of certificates. These time periods range from three years for an initial certificate in Missouri to 10 years for Continuous Professional Certification in Missouri and Professional Certification in Nebraska.

In general, credit toward recertification can be earned by participating in a variety of professional development activities, including college coursework, district in-service, instructional supervision, and travel. In Nebraska, additional activities may be accepted for maintenance of permanent certification since local school boards can define what counts as professional growth.

In most of the Central Region states, there are few specific requirements for, or restrictions on, the content of professional development for renewal of certification. Nebraska requires that those seeking a Professional Certificate complete a graduate degree in the same area as their undergraduate degree. North Dakota requires hours in pedagogy or in the content area in which the teacher is certified. South Dakota requires that credits be related to the teacher preparation standards found in state regulations. These standards are highly correlated to the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards.

Several states exert an indirect influence on the nature of the professional development in which teachers participate through their accreditation process. For example, through the accreditation process in Kansas, teachers develop individual professional development plans that are tied to school and district improvement goals. The professional development activities they participate in as part of accomplishing these goals often count as points for recertification, but the state does not dictate the content of the professional development, only its connection to improvement goals.

Accreditation will soon play an increased role in North Dakota teachers' lives as well. Although there is currently no requirement in North Dakota that professional development be tied to particular content, proposed changes to accreditation policies will link professional development with content standards and assessments.

Under accreditation rules in Colorado, districts must create professional development plans that help them reach improvement goals, including improved performance on state assessments. Consequently, most Colorado districts offer professional development related to implementation of standards, performance assessment, and data-driven decision making.

The approach in Wyoming is more direct. To meet the proficient level of the state accreditation rubric for professional development (see Appendix B), districts must create a professional

development plan that incorporates research-based strategies and helps teachers acquire knowledge and skills about the development, alignment, and implementation of standards and standards-based assessments. This requirement, in addition to increased pressure to improve student performance on state assessments, has encouraged many Wyoming teachers to participate in district professional development or college coursework that helps them in the areas emphasized in the rubric.

Several states are planning to change certification requirements to provide more guidance about the content of professional development or to tie it more strongly to teachers' daily work or school improvement. For example, in Kansas, the goal is to revamp recertification requirements to bring them more in line with licensure requirements. If approved, the new rules will go into effect in 2003. The proposed changes to the regulations present a three-tiered approach to awarding points toward recertification:

> *Level 1: Knowledge.*
> One point per contact hour
>
> *Level 2: Application.*
> Two times the number of knowledge points. (To receive application points, the teacher must demonstrate application of the information gained at the knowledge level.)
>
> *Level 3: Impact.*
> Three times the number of knowledge points. (To receive impact points, teachers must demonstrate the impact of the knowledge and skills acquired and applied.)

Points from each level for a particular professional development "activity" are added together. For example, if a teacher attended a 10-hour workshop in the summer, she would receive 10 points. If she also demonstrated application of the knowledge acquired in the workshop, she would receive an additional 20 points, for a total of 30 points. If she demonstrated impact of the knowledge and skills acquired and applied, she would receive an additional 30 points, for a total of 60 points.

The new regulations also require that anyone filing a professional development plan for renewal purposes include activities addressing at least two of three areas: (1) skills and knowledge required for a specific content endorsement, (2) professional education standards (i.e., knowledge and skills to perform in a particular role or position), and (3) service to the profession (i.e., activities that help others acquire proficiency in instructional systems, pedagogy, or content or directly relate to licensure of professional educators, accreditation processes, or professional organizations.

Wyoming may tighten its certification process by requiring that the content of credit hours for renewal be related to implementation of standards, development of assessments, or the process of school improvement (especially how to use data). This change would make certification requirements more consistent with accreditation requirements.

Induction and Mentoring

Induction and mentoring programs are one way to address the specific professional development needs of new teachers. They also can help new teachers develop the habit of lifelong learning. Although there are several benefits to having an induction program, they are not required in Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming. Several of these states are considering changes in this policy area over the next few years, however. For example, currently Wyoming is collecting data on various induction programs run by districts and funding the development of a prototype program in one district. Beginning this year, the Kansas legislature provided funds to pay mentor teachers a $1,000 stipend. To participate in the voluntary program, districts had to submit an application that provided details about their program, including a timeline of activities that demonstrated continuous support for new teachers throughout their first year. The state published mentor training guidelines and a mentoring handbook to help districts develop their programs. The state also provided mentor training through the Education Service Centers, which are for-profit intermediate service agencies. To receive funds for a second year, districts must submit an evaluation report that addresses retention rates and other outcomes of their mentor program.

The support for professional development provided by the induction and mentoring programs in the two states that have them could be stronger. Colorado requires new teachers to participate in an induction program but does not provide funding or require specific activities under the program. In Missouri, two years of mentoring are required for new teachers but the nature of the mentoring experience is not well defined.

Designated Time for Professional Development

Another way that states regulate professional development is by designating the number of hours or days per year that districts must provide professional development. Nebraska requires that districts provide 10 hours of professional development per year. North Dakota districts are required to implement a policy of professional growth for all teachers. All teachers must participate in 64 clock hours of in-service related to their teaching assignments during each five years of the accreditation process. The professional growth policy must be filed with the state education agency; districts are expected to monitor and enforce the policy. The state also designates as professional development the two days during which the North Dakota Education Association holds its annual conference.

Other Guidance for Professional Development

No state in the Central Region has officially adopted standards for professional development. Nebraska, however, has adopted a state professional development policy (see Appendix C). This policy provides guidance to districts by asserting the State Board of Education's beliefs about the characteristics of effective local staff development, including its role in school improvement and the need to include parental input and evaluation of activities.

Rather than setting standards, several states have provided guidelines that explicitly feature or reflect the National Staff Development Council standards. For example, the *Missouri Professional Development Guidelines* provides districts and schools with detailed information

about the state rules and regulations governing professional development, as well as how to plan, implement and evaluate professional development. The NSDC standards are featured prominently in the guidelines, and many of the suggestions for developing, delivering, and evaluating professional development are keyed to these standards. Other features of the guidelines include sample professional development plans and surveys and information about data-driven decision-making, program evaluation, and models of professional development. Development guidelines are consistent with the Missouri School Improvement Process (see Appendix D).

Similarly, Kansas provides its districts with a document, *Results-Based Staff Development: Guidelines and Quality Practices*, which is based on the NSDC standards (see Appendix E). State department of education staff are using a self-assessment tool keyed to the NSDC standards in their work with districts. They are also identifying districts that exemplify the 12 standards and will share information about these selected districts' professional development programs to help other districts understand how to put the standards into practice.

North Dakota and Wyoming also provide documents that offer professional development guidance to their schools and districts. In North Dakota, the Professional Standards and Practices Board developed the *Professional Development Guidelines* document, and provides training on how to use the guidelines to local teams from across the state. A self-assessment tool aligned with the guidelines is also available. In addition, the state department of education has developed guidelines for the components of a professional development plan; all districts applying for Title I, II, IV, or VI program funds in the state must develop a comprehensive written professional development plan that includes these components. Wyoming has a professional development handbook that helps districts create staff development plans. The handbook is currently being revised to more closely reflect the NSDC standards and state accreditation requirements.

One way that the Colorado Department of Education provides guidance to districts about professional development is by including a copy of *Guidelines for Professional Development of Educators in Colorado* as part of the application packet for competitive grants administered by the Department. These grants include federal funds, such as Goals 2000, Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration, and Reading Excellence Act, as well as grants funded by the Colorado legislature. The *Guidelines* were developed by the Colorado Staff Development Council and reflect the NSDC standards. They were adapted from work completed by the state department of education in the mid-1990s as part of the implementation of standards-based reforms. Applicants are encouraged to use the guidelines when planning and conducting the professional development they have designed to help them accomplish the goals of the grant.

South Dakota provides guidance about professional development on the state department of education's Web site under information about various federal programs, such as Class Size Reduction and Title II, that are available to districts and schools. Included on the Web site are ideas for appropriate professional development activities and various lists characterizing effective professional development.

Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska provide additional guidance about professional development by sponsoring professional development conferences each year. Missouri sponsors the Missouri Network for Staff Development, which provides assistance to schools and districts in the area of

staff development and serves as a clearinghouse of information and resources related to professional development strategies and successful programs. For example, the state will produce and disseminate a video of the schools and districts that received site visits from the 2001 National Awards Program for Model Professional Development. In addition, Missouri has an Internet course (PD101) for Professional Development Committee chairs, and a series of six workshops to help them understand how to plan, implement, and evaluate professional development.

Table 1. Teacher Certification Requirements in the Central Region States

State	Number of credits	Number of years	Specific Content Requirements
Colorado	90 clock hours	5	No specific requirements
Kansas	120 points for individuals with advanced degree, 160 points for individuals with bachelor's degree — half of which shall be college or university credit (1 semester hour of college credits counts as 20 points)	5	Sequential experiences designed to improve performance in area of certification or in area of new endorsement being sought. Should also reflect the individual's job-related needs and correlate with needs of the applicant's education agency.
Missouri	30 clock hours plus other requirements depending on type of certificate	3 (PC I) 7 (PC II) 10 (CPC)	Tied to school improvement plan.
Nebraska	6 credit hours and 1–3 years of teaching experience depending on level of certification	5 (initial certificate) 7 (standard certificate) 10 (professional certificate) 6 (permanent certificate)	Professional certificate requires masters in same area as undergraduate degree. Requirements for professional growth for permanent certification determined by local board.
North Dakota	4 credit hours	5	Pedagogy or content area in which certified
South Dakota	6 credit hours	5	Must relate to teacher preparation standards. Those from out-of-state must take courses in human relations and South Dakota Indian Studies.
Wyoming	5 credit hours	5	Must relate to education.

Evaluation

Although states in the Central Region are paying increasing attention to evaluation of professional development, current evaluations of state and district professional development offerings are often limited to perceptions of the usefulness of information or materials presented.

Questions on evaluation forms are likely to include "What did you learn?" and "What will you do with it?" In most cases, evaluation information is reviewed by individual events, and therefore does not provide an assessment of a total professional development program . There are indications, however, that evaluation of professional development is changing. Several states are providing guidance to districts on how to evaluate their professional development programs in terms of changes in teacher practice and student learning. These efforts appear to be in early stages of development, in part because districts are just beginning to develop expertise in the collection and use of data.

States usually require that districts evaluate district-level professional development for which participants will receive credit toward recertification. In Wyoming, the Professional Teaching Standards Board provides a sample form that districts can use to evaluate their professional development offerings. The form includes a question about what follow-up is needed for the participant to effectively use the skills and/or concepts presented. Evaluation forms are usually reviewed by the workshop presenters for the purpose of making improvements in future presentations. State department of education staff does not usually formally review or report evaluation results across a set of events to get a "big picture" sense of the overall effectiveness of professional development being offered by districts in the state.

Missouri is noteworthy for its efforts to evaluate the overall impact of the professional development projects supported by state funds. Some of the larger projects (e.g., reading initiative, mathematics project, SuccessLink, STARR, and the RPDCs) are being evaluated separately as well. Similarly, North Dakota conducted an evaluation of the impact of a project to disseminate its professional development guidelines. There were two important outcomes of this evaluation: (1) information about the impact of the project and (2) a tool, derived from the interview questions, that districts can use for self-assessment of their professional development programs.

Some states are beginning to focus more closely on the link between professional development and student learning and to reflect this focus in accreditation or grant requirements. For example, to score at the highest level of the Wyoming accreditation rubric for professional development, districts must provide evidence of improved teacher practice and student achievement. Similarly, Missouri schools and districts are now required to evaluate their professional development on five levels: reactions, learning, organizational support and change, use of new knowledge and skills, and student outcomes. The levels are based on the work of Tom Guskey (2000). Most grants that Colorado distributes to districts require them to provide information on changes in teacher behavior and student achievement. Common ways to collect teacher behavior data are observation and self-reporting. State assessment data (CSAP) and other curriculum-based measures are used to evaluate student learning.

Through its accreditation process, Kansas requires districts to report their staff development priorities, ways in which the development or enhancement of staff knowledge and skills will be assessed, and the percent of staff at various levels of implementation. The levels are non-use, awareness, demonstration, integration, and transfer (a level of expertise that allows someone to train/mentor others). The state is tapping the experience of its Nationally Board certified teachers to define appropriate guidance to districts, schools and teachers about sources of evidence and ways of documenting the link between changes in teacher practice and student achievement.

Nebraska is revising guidance to its Education Service Units (ESUs) about how they should conduct the required seven-year evaluation of their programs and services. Currently, the purpose of the evaluation is to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of the core services (i.e., professional development, technology, and instructional materials services) the ESU provides. These services are intended to improve teaching and learning by focusing on school improvement and other educational priorities set by the state. The draft guidance proposes that the ESUs shift to a comprehensive improvement process that includes formative and summative data collection and review. A major issue for the intermediate agencies is how to measure the impact of their services. Several ESUs are piloting the new process and participating in discussions about appropriate data to collect. Missouri is undertaking a similar effort by convening the directors of the Regional Professional Development Centers to discuss appropriate data to collect to determine the impact of services, in particular to low-performing schools.

Funding Policies

This section describes how Central Region states provide funding for state-level and district-level professional development activities. Most of the states provide at least some funding through appropriations or grants.

Kansas, Missouri, and Wyoming appropriate funds to support district-level professional development. In Kansas, the state legislature currently appropriates $2.5 million that is distributed to districts to help offset their costs associated with professional development. Districts receive 40–50 cents for every dollar they invest in professional development. To receive the funds, a district must have a five-year professional development plan on file with the department of education and submit a budget. In Missouri, one percent of state-aid for education funding, about $15 million in 2001, is distributed to districts for district-level professional development. Wyoming districts receive $100 per child per year to support professional development. There is no requirement, however, that the money be spent on professional development. Records have not been kept on how districts spend these funds, but a project currently underway will gather this information. Depending on the findings, there may be changes in this policy. Policymakers, the Professional Teaching Standards Board and leaders of various professional associations, such as the Wyoming Education Association and the School Boards Association, met last year to discuss the need to increase funding for professional development. The effort was unsuccessful, however, because there was considerable pressure to use the funds to increase teacher salaries.

Intermediate Agencies Involvement

Several states provide funds to districts indirectly through intermediate service agencies, which then provide districts with professional development services. The Nebraska legislature appropriates approximately $9.5 million per year and distributes it by formula to the 18 Education Service Units. Missouri provides each of its nine Regional Professional Development Centers with funds to provide services to districts. This year the nine centers shared approximately $2.2 million. The North Dakota legislature provides about $10,000 per year to each of 10 Teacher Learning Centers. These centers serve primarily as curriculum materials storage and distribution locations that are shared among districts (e.g., inflatable planetarium, sample texts). Centers have a contact person in each school in their region. They publicize and

coordinate trainings that are available in their regions, but center staff does not provide trainings to districts.

Direct District and School Support

In some states, the legislature provides funds for special statewide projects or grants to districts or schools. These projects and grants are usually designed to address specific priorities. For example, in 2000, the Colorado legislature provided funds for Teacher Development grants. Through this competitive program, 100 schools received grants of $20,000 for a two-year period. The grants are intended to improve student achievement in reading, writing, mathematics, and science. Similarly, the South Dakota legislature funded a statewide reading initiative for K–3 teachers, and the Wyoming legislature designated $150,000 for a project that focuses on educator quality and retention issues. In addition, to support the implementation of standards-based education in general and its assessment program in particular, the state funds a professional development institute that begins with a week-long session in the summer followed by four, two-day sessions during the school year. Money from the legislature in Nebraska provided funds to involve teams from across the state in assessment training with a national consultant. In addition, grants were provided to the Education Service Units to work with districts on developing and implementing standards-based curriculum and assessments. Missouri's legislature authorized the state department of education to use one percent of state aid to education funds for state level professional development activities. A variety of competitive grants are funded with this money. Several are described in the next section.

Use of Federal Funds

All of the states use discretionary federal funds (e.g., Title I, Title II, Goals 2000) to support state-level professional development activities. For example, North Dakota used Goals 2000 funds to develop and promote professional development guidelines. About 400 people participated in the first two years of the project. The goal was to help school and district staff understand that professional development is "the engine that drives the car of school improvement" [comment from interview]. Participants in the project attend several sessions over a year-long period and learn about the change process and how to use the guidelines to develop or refine a professional development plan. Evaluation of the first years of the project lead to creation of a tool that schools could use to assess their professional development program. The project also produced two videos that document conversations with "successful schools" about their approaches to professional development.

Wyoming is using Title II funds to support a Leadership Academy for Professional Development. The academy is designed to help school or district teams enhance, implement, and evaluate their professional development plans. Topics addressed include models of professional development, leadership, team building, organization design theory, systems thinking, change theory, implementation, and results-driven evaluation. Academy sessions are spread over one year and occur in four, four-day sessions. Wyoming also uses Title I, II, and VI to help support two school improvement conferences each year. Attendance at these conferences has steadily increased in the past several years, and they are seen as significant opportunities to learn about the elements of school improvement as well as standards-based education.

All states in the region use federal funds to support teachers who are pursuing National Board Certification. Kansas, Missouri, Colorado, and North Dakota also provide state funds to help candidates cover assessment fees. Kansas teachers who earn National Board Certification receive $1,000 each year for 10 years. North Dakota Board-certified teachers receive $1,500 per year for four years if they are teaching and involved with a teacher mentoring and evaluation program. South Dakota Board-certified teachers receive a $2,000 per year stipend for five years.

Another way that states provide funds for professional development is by competing for grants from the federal government or foundations. For example, Colorado has distributed $400,000 to each of 16 schools through its Reading Excellence Act grant. Through a state improvement grant from the federal government, North Dakota is focusing on developing a data collection system. As part of this project, a national expert in the use of data in schools and districts is conducting a pilot study of data-driven school improvement processes in three North Dakota districts.

All of the states in the Central Region have received technology leadership grants from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. These grants help principals and superintendents focus on systemic reform and create high-performing learning environments through technology instruction. All states have also applied to participate in the MarcoPolo Professional Development Program. This program is tailored to the needs of each state and is designed to help teachers master the use of Internet content in their classrooms. The program uses a train-the-trainer model. In North Dakota, for example, at least 75 teachers will be trained during the next two years, with the Teacher Center Network coordinating the roll-out of the training.

Other Funding Sources

Sometimes special sources of funding become available to support professional development. For example, in Colorado tobacco settlement money is being used to fund the state's Read to Achieve program. This program is focused on implementation of intensive interventions to help second and third graders learn to read. To accomplish this goal, teachers must learn as well. Thirty-five million dollars has been distributed to 550 buildings during the first 18 months of the program. Additional funds are available to schools that show results, which are defined as 25 percent of those students receiving help meet standards. These funds are likely to be available for another two years. To receive funds, schools must show that selected interventions are research-based and address the six dimensions of reading outlined in the National Reading Panel report.

Not surprisingly, Central Region states aggressively pursue as many grant opportunities as possible. When possible, they leverage funds from a variety of sources to extend projects to more sites or to provide a more intensive professional development experience by providing time for coaching or other on-site, follow-up assistance.

Table 2. Funding for Professional Development in the Central Region States

STATE	National Board Certification Support**	Funds Provided Directly to Districts*	Funds Provided to Intermediate Service Agencies
Colorado	30 candidates subsidized at 50% of fee	No.	No, but some receive $10,000 for administrative costs/
Kansas	27 candidates at 50% fee using subsidy funds, other 50% paid by state. An additional 60 candidates receive 50% funding of fee from state. Selected according to slots designated for 10 State Board districts on a first-come basis. Teachers receive $1,000 a year for 10 years of the certificate.	Yes. Districts can apply for funds to partially cover costs. $2.5 million are available. Restrictions apply.	No.
Missouri	$97,500 in 2001 budget to support 100 candidates at 25% of fee and substitutes for teachers preparing portfolios. State funds cover an additional 50% of the fee. Selected on a first-come basis.	Yes. 1% of foundation funding distributed to districts by formula.	Yes, nine centers share approximately $2.2 million.
Nebraska	17 candidates at 50% of fee. Selected on a first-come basis.	No.	Yes. $9.5 million distributed by formula among the Education Service Units.
North Dakota	10 candidates at 50%, selected on a first-come basis. $41,500 available in state funds to assist candidates with assessment costs. $1500 per year for four years if teaching and involved with a teacher mentoring and evaluation program.	No.	Yes. $10,000 per year for each of 10 centers to store curriculum materials, coordinate and disseminate information about workshops.
South Dakota	10 candidates at 50%, selected on first-come basis. Reimbursement of fee for those certified. Annual $2,000 stipend for five years.	No.	No.
Wyoming	$2,000 for three years; subsidizes 25% of candidate fees for 20 teachers (amount adjusted if fewer candidates). Selected by lottery.	Yes. $100 per student (not required to spend on professional development).	No.

*This refers to funds other than federal Title I, II, IV, and VI money.

Note: Unless other indicated, funds to support National Board certification fees are federal NBPTS candidate subsidy funds.

PROGRAMMATIC POLICIES

Programmatic policies are related to structures such as offices/divisions, programs, initiatives, activities, organizations and entities. This section discusses how each state distributes responsibility for professional development within its state education agency and provides some details about the types of professional development programs and activities they support at the state level. Because support for professional development is strengthened by developing relationships with other entities interested in professional development, this section also identifies the relationships between the state departments of education and other state and national organizations.

State Education Agency Support

Colorado. Within the state department of education, the Special Services section houses several units that have responsibility for professional development. These include Title I and Title II as well as the Competitive Grants and Awards unit, which has one person whose title includes the words "professional development." The Professional Services section of the state department includes the Educator Licensing unit. There is an Educator Professional Standards Board that functions in an advisory capacity to this unit. The Educational Services section houses the regional services teams, which provide support to the department's Regional Service Centers. These centers assist districts by providing professional development related to standards, assessments, and accreditation. They also help districts use a data-driven approach to school improvement. Some of the features of this professional development are job-embedded coaching, creative use of technology, content-rich experiences, and a literacy focus.

The Regional Service Centers are partnerships of districts, state office staff, and Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES). The centers are funded by combining dollars from a number of federal and state sources. The BOCES are a way for districts to join together to receive services. They are often used for special education but also are authorized to provide purchasing, administration, and media services. Some have emphasized professional development in the past. For example, the Centennial BOCES in Longmont received several Goals 2000 grants and produced materials and training that have helped districts across the state understand many aspects of standards-based education.

Kansas. The Learning Services Division of the state department of education is comprised of four teams: Certification and Teacher Education, School Improvement and Accreditation, State and Federal Programs, and Student Support Services. In this division, there is a position for an Education Program Consultant, Staff Development. There is also a Professional Standards Board under the Certification and Teacher Education team. This board is responsible for developing and recommending for adoption rules and regulations for professional standards governing teaching and school administrator preparation and admission to and continuance in the profession, including the requirements for continuing education for teachers and administrators.

There is a system of intermediate service agencies in Kansas, but these agencies do not receive state funds. The Education Service Centers (ESCs) provide services to districts, one of which is professional development. Districts pay membership fees and/or fees for services from these agencies. The centers serve as a communication link to the state. Not only do they help the

department by disseminating and gathering information from districts, but they also provide the department with views from the field. The ESCs and the SEA also collaborate on trainings, sometimes serving as co-presenters. On occasion, the state department contracts with one or more of the intermediate agencies to design and deliver trainings or to develop materials. The association of the ESCs meets on a regular basis with the Commissioner of Education to discuss education issues in the state and to share information.

Missouri. Most of the state staff whose primary concern is professional development is located in the Division of Urban and Teacher Education. Within the division there is a position titled "Coordinator of Professional Development" and another titled "Director of Professional Development." Several sections within the division address professional development; these include the Leadership Academy, Professional Development, Teacher Certification, Teacher Education, and the Teacher Recruitment and Retention sections. Work of the Division of School Improvement, which includes the Curriculum Services Section and Title I and other federal programs, also addresses professional development.

The Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDCs), which are intermediate service agencies, are part of the Division of Urban and Teacher Education. They were established under Senate Bill 380 (The Outstanding Schools Act, 1993) to assist districts with implementation of state standards and assessments by providing professional development. They also work with districts to create training materials. One of the goals of the RPDCs is to help districts build ongoing, job-embedded, site-based, systemic professional development.

Nebraska. Most professional development functions within the Nebraska Department of Education are housed in three units related to school improvement. There are three units within this section: (1) Staff Development/Instructional Issues, (2) Accreditation and School Improvement, and (3) Curriculum and Instruction. Teacher certification falls under the Certification/Adult Program Services section.

The system of intermediate service agencies, the Education Service Units, was established by legislation to provide core services (professional development, technology, and instructional materials services) to member districts in an effective and efficient way. The ESUs, funded primarily by the state, function individually and as a system, working with the state department of education to address statewide issues, such as standards implementation.

North Dakota. Among the responsibilities of the Education Improvement unit is administration of the state's Goals 2000 funding (awards to local districts and statewide planning), the administration of Title VI of ESEA which provides grants to local districts, and coordination of department conferences related to educational improvement. This unit also administers the math assessment project and Class Size Reduction Act funds. The Compensatory Education unit is responsible for administration of Title I and Homeless Children programs, which include education and training programs for teachers. The School Approval and Accreditation unit, which is part of a separate organizational group in the department, is responsible for assisting K–12 schools in the accreditation process. It provides technical assistance regarding state and federal legislation and administers credentials for administrators, among other responsibilities.

The Education Standards and Practices Board is independent of the State Department of Public Instruction. Its responsibilities are to review North Dakota's educator's code of ethics and rules, standards and procedures for licensure, teacher education program approval, and professional development of educators. The Board also initiates and/or hears complaints about code violations. The Board has several goals related to professional development, including encouraging the use of effective practices for professional development, relating knowledge of these practices to certification renewal and program approval processes, and establishing relationships with professional groups that share its mission.

As previously mentioned, North Dakota has a system of Teacher Learning Centers, which function primarily as clearinghouses for curriculum materials. They also coordinate and broker professional development for districts in their region.

South Dakota. South Dakota's Office of Policy and Accountability implements the education policies of the legislature and the state board of education. These include standards for teacher preparation, staff certification, and school accreditation. This office also includes the Professional Teachers Practices Board and Standards Commission. The commission has developed a code of ethics for teachers and a model teacher evaluation policy.

The Division of Education Services and Resources houses the Office of Technical Assistance and the Office of Technology. The Office of Technical Assistance's charge is to help local schools improve curriculum and instruction through alignment with South Dakota's content standards, and to implement effective federal programs (Title I, II, VI, VII), promote the safety of students, and provide for the assessment of students, programs, and schools. Most services are provided upon request of the local district. The Office also initiates some services and invites districts to participate.

The Office of Technology oversees the Technology for Teaching and Learning (TTL) academies and a number of other technology initiatives, including a Gates Foundation grant for technology leadership.

Wyoming. In the Wyoming Department of Education, the School Improvement group includes federal programs that have professional development components (e.g., Title I, Title II, Title VI, Class Size Reduction, and Comprehensive School Reform). Staff who oversee accreditation and standards implementation are also included in this group.

Wyoming also has a Professional Teaching Standards Board that is independent of the Department of Education. Its role is to establish and review rules and regulations for teacher and administrator education and certification. As part of those processes, it is authorized to establish reasonable fees, revoke or suspend certification, and require fingerprinting and background checks for initial certification. The Board is also allowed to enter into reciprocity agreements with other states. The Board and the Department work closely together, especially around teacher professional development since it is the Board's responsibility to approve credits for renewal of certification.

Statewide Initiatives

Each state has a number of initiatives that contribute to teachers' professional growth. Examples of some initiatives that characterize those across the region follow. Some of the initiatives are funded by state dollars; others, by federal dollars.

The Colorado Reading Excellence Act Partnership is designed to serve districts and schools whose students score far below the state average in reading and have a number of risk factors that increase their chances of failing to learn how to read. The Partnership promotes the use of research-based instructional strategies for teaching students how to read and how to prevent reading difficulties. Grants are provided to districts and schools to provide professional development to help teachers learn these strategies and to address a number of other issues including kindergarten transition, family literacy services, and the coordination of reading, library and literacy programs. Schools and districts may also apply for funds to provide tutoring that is consistent with reading research and the reading program used by the child's school. One of the goals is to produce effective, scientifically based reading instruction that improves student achievement in reading. The grant is also intended to change teaching practices and attitudes.

The Kansas State Department of Education sponsors content-area academies and workshops on results-based staff development. The academies are usually collaboratively provided by state and intermediate agency staff. This allows training to be tailored to the needs of a particular region in the state. The goal is to build capacity in districts. Similarly, Nebraska state education agency staff spends part of their time working collaboratively with Education Service Unit staff to develop and provide professional development for educators across the state. Sometimes these trainings involve districts in an individual ESU area, sometimes in a region of the state, and sometimes from across the state. For example, during summer 2001, state staff worked with ESU staff to help districts develop assessments to determine if students were meeting mathematics standards.

Capacity building for administrators and teachers is the emphasis for several projects in Missouri. For example, through the Select Teachers as Regional Resources (STARR) program, master classroom teachers receive intensive training in effective instructional techniques, curriculum alignment, assessment, and other areas related to school reform, and then are released from the classroom for a year to serve as resources for colleagues in their region of the state. Other projects focus on improving teachers' knowledge in specific subjects such as reading, mathematics, science, fine arts, and economics education. Among the projects that will help principals and superintendents hone their skills are the Leadership Academy and the Systemic Reform and Implementation project. Another project supports Missouri's participation in the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) assessment portfolio field study and training for individuals to score performance-based assessments. There are also projects that address mentoring for teachers in rural areas and for new principals in St. Louis. Another funds an academy and network for new superintendents to increase the retention rate for this group. One of the largest projects funded by the state is associated with the Missouri Assessment Program. The project is in the process of training thousands of teachers statewide in the development of assessment items as well as the administration and scoring of performance-based assessments.

One North Dakota project with a strong professional development component is the North Dakota Curriculum Initiative. This project is funded with dollars from various federal programs. The purpose of the Initiative is to work with curriculum directors and representatives from professional organizations in the state to address curriculum issues, especially standards implementation. Members of the Initiative receive professional development on a variety of topics. Another North Dakota project is using Title I and Title VI funds to provide standards awareness training and $20,000–$50,000 grants to districts to work on standards, assessment, and related issues.

Governor Janklow of South Dakota initiated the Technology for Teaching and Learning (TTL) academies in 1997. The purpose of this initiative is to provide an intensive professional development experience for teachers to help them become proficient users of technology. Each year, the program starts with a 20-day summer institute and is followed by a series of activities spread over the year. Goals 2000 funds and the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund were leveraged to support the TTL academies. The TTL academies establishes a cadre of teachers who integrate technology into the curriculum, model effective teaching practices, and assist colleagues in learning how to use technology to enhance teaching and learning. Academies for school and network administrators were added in 1999.

In Wyoming, Project WYO.BEST (Better Education Through Standards and Technology) is designed to enable educators to use technology to enhance teaching and learning. Participants acquire broad-based knowledge and understanding of the skills needed to incorporate technology into the classroom efficiently and effectively. In 2001, the first phase of the project provided superintendents and curriculum directors with the knowledge and tools to lead professional development in their districts. As part of their training, participants learned how to use a variety of software packages (e.g., ACTNow!, Microsoft Excel, PowerPoint) and the Internet. Training was provided by industry-level trainers at the IBM Learning Center in New York State. In the second phase of the project, up to 900 teachers will participate in 20 days of training, engaging in a variety of activities (whole group hands-on workshop, individual sessions, and small group interaction) to learn how to use technology to improve student learning in a standards-based classroom. In phase 3 of the project, participants will model for other teachers in their districts the best practices they have learned through the project. The state will provide one laptop computer for each two participants from a district. The Department will also provide each district with an LCD projector and a SMART Board.

The project, a partnership between the state department and IBM, is the outgrowth of a pilot project begun in a Wyoming district in 1997. Teachers in that project had sustained training and mentoring in student-centered instructional approaches, standards-based instruction, performance-based assessment, and technology integration. The legislature awarded $4.2 million to the department for the project.

State Department Relationships with Other Education Organizations

Four of the Central Region states (Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, and Wyoming) have staff development organizations that are affiliates of the National Staff Development Council. Although Nebraska does not have a staff development council, the ESUPDO group functions much in the same way.

Colorado and Missouri also have Staff Development Leader Councils (SDLCs), which are coalitions of people interested in professional development who seek to influence district and state educational policy and practice. The councils use a variety of strategies, including meeting with policymakers, providing assistance to them, and educating them about high-quality professional development.

At one time, Kansas also had a staff development leadership council. That group merged with 23 other organizations and became part of the Kansas Learning First Alliance (KLFA). One of the goals of this group is to help people understand the importance of professional development for teachers. The KLFA is encouraging legislators to visit schools to talk with teachers and to observe firsthand the challenges they face. The Alliance also sponsored a professional development survey in 2000 to provide policymakers with a status check and policy recommendations.

Missouri is one of the states that has a partnership with the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF). Kansas also a group that was affiliated with NCTAF but lost its funding. During its short existence, the group heightened awareness about teacher quality issues and spurred some districts to raise salaries and give attention to retention rates.

It is important to note that collaboration within state departments of education seems to be as much of a trend as collaboration with partners in the field. Representatives from Missouri, Nebraska, and Kansas talked specifically about this aspect of their work during interviews. They reported that staff are working across teams to discuss issues, plan activities, and use funds more efficiently.

COMPARISON OF CENTRAL REGION STATE POLICIES TO EXPERT RECOMMENDATIONS

The National Staff Development Council (NSDC) has been working with many of its affiliate member states, including Colorado, Kansas, and Missouri, to help policymakers understand what effective professional development looks like and how they can promote it through policies. Based on research and best practice, NSDC is developing tools that explain how policies related to the following 10 areas can support teacher and administrator learning that contributes to student achievement:

- New Teacher Induction/Mentoring
- Individual Growth Plans/Recertification
- School Improvement Planning and Evaluation
- Aspiring Principals Support and Development
- Principal Development and Recertification
- Superintendent Development and Recertification
- District Level Improvement/Staff Development Plan and Evaluation

- Allocation of Time and Dollars
- Staff Development Standards
- School Board Training

Other policies that contribute to effective professional development address the role of higher education, intermediate service agencies, parent education, staff developer certification, and state recognition of staff development results. In addition, states may consider policies that support content academies, school-based staff developers, and mentor sites.

How do policies in Central Region states stack up against the NSDC list? Only two Central Region states require new teacher induction programs, but neither of these states provides specific funding for the programs nor do they review the programs to determine if they have the potential to provide the support new teachers need. A few states require individual professional development plans that are tied to school improvement goals, but these are only loosely associated with recertification. Most states require only that credits relate to pedagogy or the content area in which the teacher is certified.

School improvement is an increasing focus in most of the states and professional development plans are part of school improvement and accreditation. In some states (Kansas, Missouri, Wyoming) the quality of the plans is monitored to some degree through the accreditation process. It is still the case, however, that professional development in many districts is a series of disconnected events.

Principal and superintendent development is beginning to gain attention in the region, but few states have extensive efforts underway. As mentioned previously, all states have received funds for technology leadership through the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and Missouri has funded several initiatives to support principal and superintendent development.

While states fund professional development at the state and district levels in a variety of ways, Missouri seems to provide the strongest funding for state-level activities by allocating one percent of state aid to education funding for that purpose. This consistent source of funding allows Missouri to take a long-term view and develop programs that run long enough for participants to develop deeper levels of knowledge and skills. Although Nebraska does not provide a large amount of money for statewide professional development projects, it does provide $9.5 million to its intermediate service agencies. This allows districts across the state to receive services, but the nature and intensity of services that districts need when they are trying to implement standards mean ESUs will need increased funding. Most states do not require districts to provide teachers with a specified amount of time for professional development. If they do specify time, it is usually minimal (e.g., 10 hours per year, 64 hours over 5 years). Several interviewees mentioned that teachers need more time for professional development that involves them in working with their colleagues during the school day.

Although no states have adopted professional development standards, most of the Central Region states have developed guidelines for districts that either explicitly use or reflect the NSDC standards. Interview questions and document review did not address school board training, and no interviewees mentioned it as part of accreditation requirements.

Hayes Mizell (2001) of the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation suggests five actions states might take to support professional development. Foremost among these is to require that recipients of state funds and state-administered federal funds focus their professional development on increasing students' performance. Second, states should insist that districts and schools document how state-funded professional development has or has not improved the day-to-day practice of teachers and administrators. Third, states should establish criteria for what constitutes effective, results-based staff development that merits state funding. Fourth, states should abandon policies and practices that have the effect of modeling or affirming ineffective professional development. Examples include conducting one-day workshops that address complex content or changes in practice that have no follow-up, or basing certification renewal on course credits or hours of participation without regard for what educators need to know to improve their students' achievement. Fifth, states should fund research and evaluation projects to determine whether the professional development the state funds is reducing achievement gaps.

How consistent are Central Region state policies with Mizell's recommendations? Those interviewed in each state said that the purpose of professional development is to improve student learning. Some felt that their state policies did not fully reflect this purpose. For example, policies did not require teachers to tie their professional development to students' learning needs. They know that it is easy for people to say that the purpose of their professional development is improved student learning, but reaching that goal requires thoughtful planning and new ways of thinking about the types of learning experiences teachers need.

Some worry that the local level of knowledge about what effective professional development looks like in practice and about how to implement it is limited and will not lead to the needed changes. In part, this may be attributed to the rural nature of the Central Region where small districts usually do not have the resources to support a person whose sole responsibility is staff development. These duties are often assigned to the principal, who has little time, and perhaps little experience, to devote to the task. Some states (Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska) have addressed this issue by establishing intermediate service agencies that provide professional development and technical assistance to districts. Nevertheless, the amount of funding available to these agencies varies and their services must be spread over a large geographic region and/or number of districts.

Some states in the Central Region require that districts or schools evaluate professional development projects funded by the state. The evaluations do not always examine a link between programs and student achievement. Results are not typically shared with policymakers except in general ways, neither are they aggregated across sites in a formal way to determine how well funds are being used statewide. However, there is some movement in that direction. Missouri will conduct an evaluation of the overall impact of its professional development programs as well as evaluations of individual programs. North Dakota conducted an evaluation of a project to disseminate its professional development guidelines.

In some states, short workshops without follow-up still exist. In general, however, states are funding statewide projects that include two-day or longer workshops with follow-up meetings scheduled over the school year. Yet, in most cases the project does not provide follow-up coaching, demonstration lessons, or study groups in teachers' schools or classrooms.

Several of the states continue to base certification renewal on credit hours or in-service credits, although a few are requiring that schools develop professional development plans tied to school improvement goals. Because these goals are based on student achievement data, there is a greater likelihood that teachers will engage in at least some professional development directly linked to what they need to know to improve student learning.

Laine (2000) suggests that policymakers need to demonstrate that professional development is a priority by showing "unwavering financial commitment" to it. She suggests that one way to do this is to pool professional development resources at the state level and award money to districts on the basis of school needs, with implementation plans that show clear alignment between measurable goals and observed outcomes. This practice would help to reduce the fragmentation that results when districts have to rely on many separate funding streams that have different requirements and purposes. Laine also recommends that state education agencies oversee local professional development resource implementation and ensure that evaluation results are available to the public.

As described previously, many states in the Central Region depend on federal funds to support state and local professional development. Although they may not pool sources of funds, they often find creative ways to leverage funds. Given the emphasis on local control in the Central Region, it is not likely that states will want to oversee professional development resource implementation and evaluation unless it occurs as part of the accreditation process and does not place additional burdens on state staff who often wear too many hats already.

When compared to recommendations from several experts, Central Region policies to support professional development are moving in the right direction, but could become more comprehensive and integrative in scope. Although there are some individual policies that are strong, such as funding for state-level activities in Missouri or strong accreditation policies that require results-based staff development in Kansas, no state has a set of strong policies that address the complete set of issues related to teacher learning identified by professional development organizations.

CONCLUSION

Central Region states have taken a variety of policy actions to support professional development. Most important, they are trying to send the message that the overriding purpose for professional development is to improve student achievement. Some of those interviewed stated this purpose more indirectly as improving schools or ensuring quality teachers. Although several states indicated that state policies, particularly those related to accreditation and school improvement, were showing an increased alignment with improved student achievement, most states acknowledged that there was room for improvement.

Professional development policy in the region is most likely to be influenced by the state department of education working with one or more partners such as legislators, the state board, professional standards board, or education associations. Several states noted a strong relationship with the governor's office. Kansas and Missouri attributed increasing influence to coalitions of professional development stakeholders, including the Kansas Learning First Alliance and the Missouri Staff Development Leadership Council and Missouri Staff Development Council.

Policies related to funding seem to top the list of ideal policies to support professional development. In some cases, such as North Dakota and South Dakota, funding might help to raise the status of professional development. Some interviewees from these states expressed concern that many communities in their state do not consider professional development important. In Wyoming, where some funding is provided to districts, a policy is needed to ensure that districts actually spend the money on professional development. Increased funding for the state department of education and the Education Service Units in Nebraska would allow the ESUs to hire additional staff to work with schools on school improvement and standards-based education and help state education agency staff work with ESU staff to coordinate projects and build expertise in the content areas.

Next to money, time is the biggest issue that could use policy support. Missouri is aiming for the best in terms of both — 10 percent of resources and 25 percent of time devoted to professional development. Staff in Kansas would like policies that provide time for collaborative work among teachers during the school day.

Several states mentioned the importance of policies that encourage districts and the state to collect data, particularly about student outcomes, to design and evaluate professional development. There were also calls for policies that mandated induction programs and established professional development standards.

Several states (Colorado, North Dakota, and Wyoming) specifically mentioned the need to take local control into account when designing professional development policy. These states prefer an approach to policy that involves setting goals and helping districts reach them rather than mandating actions and imposing penalties.

Interviewees from almost every state responded that in order to make good decisions about professional development policy, policymakers need to know the characteristics of high-quality professional development and what it looks like in practice. They need to see it in action, preferably in districts and schools in their own state. They need to understand the connection between professional development and student achievement and how professional development fits into the school improvement process. As one interviewee put it, people need to believe that "professional development is the engine and not the ornament of school improvement." Policymakers, parents, and the community need evidence that professional development is valuable and that it matters.

Several interviewees noted that policymakers need to understand the contexts in which teachers work and how the context dictates what teachers need to learn. For example, changes in classroom behavior mean that many teachers need to learn new classroom management strategies. Understanding data collection systems and how funding levels affect the types of professional development that districts can offer will also improve policymakers' ability to enact appropriate policies.

The push in most of the states is toward looking at the impact of professional development — not without a struggle, however. States are finding that it is no easy task to make decisions about which data to collect and how to collect it without placing unreasonable human and technological burdens on the system.

In most states the amount of information that policymakers have about the impact of professional development is meager. But when legislators do receive information, it sometimes leads to action. For example, districts in North Dakota currently report to legislators about how they spend federal funds. In the last biennium, the lack of detailed information about professional development expenditures raised concerns, which lead to passage of a bill that will require districts to report the source and amount of professional development funds they expended in the 2001–2002 school year, what they were spent on, and whether the professional development correlated with any increase in reading or mathematics scores. In contrast, a few sessions ago the North Dakota legislature set the number of contact days and hours per day that teachers must meet with students. This action forced districts with early release days for professional development to eliminate them. Some districts have added days to their school calendar as an alternative strategy for finding time for professional development. A scan of professional development policies across the 50 states conducted by Hirsch, Koppich, and Knapp (1998) indicated that most states have adopted some policies to address the need for teacher development, but they have not "tackled it head-on" (p. 41). A significant challenge that remains is finding "the right balance of requirements, supports, inducements, incentives, and alliances that engages capable professionals in the enterprise of teaching and learning" (Hirsch et al., 1998, p. 31).

As a first step to improving professional development policy, policymakers need to examine the alignment of existing state policies with those that have shown the most promise for impact on teacher practice and student learning. Such policies endorse research-based guidelines for staff development, establish funding and infrastructures for local implementation, and consider the influence of teacher professional development on student learning.

Although Central Region states may not be tackling the issue of professional development policy "head-on," neither are they turning their backs on it. Some states are in the early stages of rethinking their policies. Other states in the Central Region have made significant progress in improving the quality of their professional development policies. They are seeking to strike that "right balance." The policies they have enacted provide both financial support and philosophical support that helps to change views about what it takes for professional development to lead to improved student learning.

REFERENCES

Carlson, R. (1999, February). Creating technology policy: A systemic model. *NASSP Bulletin*.

Darling-Hammond, L., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1995). Policies that support professional development in an era of reform. *Phi Delta Kappan, 76*(8), 597–604.

Education Commission of the States. (1997). Investing in teacher professional development: A look at 16 school districts. Denver, CO: Author.

Guskey, T. R. (2000). *Evaluating professional development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hirsch, E., Koppich, J. E., & Knapp, M. S. (1998, December). *What states are doing to improve the quality of teaching: A brief review of current patterns and trends*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington, Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.

Hirsch, E., Koppich, J., & Knapp, M. (2001). *Revisiting what states are doing to improve the quality of teaching: An update on patterns and trends*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington, Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.

Kansas State Department of Education. (199801). *Results-based staff development*. Retrieved November 8, 2001, from http://www.ksbe.state.ks.us/Welcome.html

Knapp, M. (1997). Between systemic reforms and the mathematics and science classroom: The dynamics of innovation, implementation, and professional learning. Research Monograph No.1. Madison, WI: National Institute for Science Education.

Laine, S. (2000). *Professional development in education and the private sector: Following leaders*. Naperville, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory.

Massell, D. (1998, July). *State strategies for building local capacity: Addressing the needs of standards-based reform* (Policy Briefs No. RB-25). Philadelphia, PA: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2000). *Missouri School Improvement Program: Third Cycle Procedures Handbook, 2001–02* (p. 26). Jefferson City, MO: Author. Retrieved November 1, 2001, from ftp://www.dese.state.mo.us/pub/divimprove/sia/msip/ thirdcycleprocedureshandbook.doc

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2000, August). *Missouri school improvement program: District response to the standards for MSIP Reviews in 2001–2002*. Jefferson City, MO: Author. Retrieved November 15, 2001, from ftp://www.dese.state.mo.us/pub/divimprove/sia/msip/districtresponse.doc

Mizell, H. (2001, February 26). *Professional development: The state it's in.* Remarks at a meeting of 40 state education officials with primary responsibilities for their agencies' administration of staff development programs. The meeting was sponsored by the National Staff Development Council and was held in Dallas, Texas. Retrieved April 6, 2001 from http://www.middleweb.com/Hmstate.html

National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) Study Group on Teacher Development, Supply, and Demand (1998, October). *The numbers game: Ensuring quantity and quality in the teaching workforce.* Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Boards of Education.

National Staff Development Council. (2000). *Staff development leadership councils.* Retrieved November 25, 2001, from http://www.nsdc.org/sdlc.htm

Renyi, J. (1996). *Teachers take charge of their learning: Transforming professional development for student success.* (Executive Summary). Washington, DC: National Fund for the Improvement of Education

Sparks, D., & Hirsh, S. A. (1997). *A new vision for staff development.* Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.

Sparks, D., & Hirsh, S. (2000). *A national plan for improving professional development.* Retrieved December 2, 2001, from http://www.nsdc.org/library/NSDCPlan.html

Stein, M., Smith, M., & Silver, E. (1999). The development of professional developers: Learning to assist teachers in new settings in new ways. *Harvard Educational Review, 69*(3), 237–269.

St. John, E. P., Ward, J. G., & Laine, S. W. M. (1999, August). *State policy on professional development: Rethinking the linkages to student outcomes.* Oak Brook, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory.

Ward, J., St. John, E., & Laine, S. (1999). State programs for funding teacher professional development. Naperville, IL: North Central Regional Education Laboratory.

APPENDIX A: DOCUMENT AND INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

Document Review Protocol

Researchers will examine each state's documents on state polices for professional development using the Document Review Protocol. The headings for the questions indicate the variables to which the questions relate.

Regulations

D-1) What are the state's regulations related to local (school and district) teacher professional development?

- How much time do teachers devote to teacher professional development?
- How are time allocations for teacher professional development distributed?
- Are students in school during required teacher professional development?
- Does local professional development need to address certain content areas?
- Do districts or schools need to have professional development plans? What is required for the plan? How does the state review the plan? Is the plan required to address changes in teacher practices? Changes in student outcomes?

Regulations

D-2) What are the state's professional development requirements for teacher license renewal/ recertification?

- What specific courses or content areas are required?
- How is required professional development different for different teachers?
- What sanctions are there for teachers who do not meet the state's professional development requirements for teacher license renewal/recertification?
- What waivers or alternatives are available for teachers who do not meet the state's professional development requirements for teacher license renewal/ recertification?

Regulations

D-3) What are the state's policies related to the induction of beginning teachers?

- For how many years?
- How are they funded?
- What are the criteria for mentors? What training is required for mentors? How is the training funded?

Guidelines

D-4) What are the state's standards for professional development or what standards does the state officially support (e.g. standards from the National Staff Development Council)?

- What other state guidance is there regarding the format, content, frequency of teacher professional development?
- What state guidance is there regarding the qualifications of professional development providers? What state guidance is there regarding approved professional development providers/consultants, e.g., a list of recommended professional development providers?
- In what ways is state guidance on professional development research-based, e.g., refer to or build on research on teacher professional development?

Infrastructures

D-5) What are the state's external infrastructures for professional development? How are they funded or supported in other ways? What services do they provide? Who are the staff and what are their qualifications? How are they monitored, e.g. through a professional development plan? How are they evaluated?

- Regional service units?
- Education networks?
- Professional associations?
- Ties with institutions of higher education?

Interview Protocol

Questions for each state that cannot be answered by the document review will be included in that state's interview protocol. Interview questions that can be answered from the documents will be excluded. The headings for the questions indicate the variables that relate to each question.

Regulations

I-1) What are the state's policies that link or align teacher professional development programs with state K–12 content standards? With state K–12 assessments?

Regulations

I-2) What state policies link teacher professional development to school improvement?

- Are schools required to develop school improvement plans? Who is required to develop these plans?
- How is teacher professional development related to school improvement plans (e.g., in learning how to develop the plans, as an element required in the plan)?

Regulations

I-3) What is the relationship between state policies for teacher professional development and policies for the following:

- pre-service education?
- teacher retention ?

Funding

I-4) How does the state provide funding for teacher professional development?

- Through funds provided for state supported professional development programs? What are the state-supported professional development programs?
- Through funds provided for local professional development? How are schools or districts chosen to participate?
- Through funds or reimbursements for individual teacher professional development? What are the requirements to obtain and use these funds?

Funding

I-5) Describe the role of Federal funds in the state's professional development policies.

- What are the sources (e.g., Title 1)?
- What regulations are associated with state or local use of these funds?

Funding (and other support)

I-6) What incentives does the state provide related to teacher professional development (e.g., to either provide or participate in teacher professional development)?

- To individual districts?
- To individual schools?
- To individual teachers?
- How does the state support National Board certification?

Evaluation

I-7) Does the state evaluate professional development (or require or suggest evaluation)? On what basis, e.g., teachers' reactions, effects on teacher practices, student outcomes?

- Of state-provided professional development?
- Of local professional development?
- Of individual teacher professional development?
- How do state policymakers use evaluation data or feedback on teacher professional development?

External Influences

I-8) What partnerships or alliances does the state have with national or regional organizations related to teacher professional development? [Examples are Staff Development Leadership Councils (SDLCs), state partnerships with the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF).]

- What has been the work of these partnerships?
- Their impact?
- Their future?

Perceptions

I-9) The following is a list of persons and organizations who might make or influence state policies for teacher professional development. Add other persons or organizations to the list as needed. Then rank these in order of influence on policies for teacher professional development (1 = most influence).

Rank Influence

_____ legislators
_____ governor
_____ state department of education
_____ state professional associations (describe: if more than, indicate below as other)_____
_____ boards of education (describe: if more than, indicate below as other) _____
_____ other professional boards describe)_____
_____ other influence(describe)_____
_____ other influence(describe)_____
_____ other influence(describe)_____

Perceptions

I-10) What do you think is the primary purpose of teacher professional development, according to the state (e.g., for individual teacher enhancement, for school improvement)?

- To what extent do your state policies reflect this purpose? 1 = little, 2 = some, 3 = much, 4 = great deal

Perceptions

I-11) What would be ideal state policies for teacher professional development?

- To what extent do your state policies compare to this ideal? 1 = little, 2 = some, 3 = much, 4 = great deal
- What actions do state policymakers need to take to achieve the ideal?

Perceptions

I-12) What information do state legislators and other policy makers in the state need to have to make good decisions about teacher professional development?

APPENDIX B: WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACCREDITATION RUBRIC

Criteria	Scoring Guide				Self-Assess Scores	WDE Scores
	4	3	2	1		
Approach	Evidence is provided by the district to ensure that district/school and individual professional development plans are based on school improvement goals/results and contain focused, sustained (with follow up), effectively organized professional development activities that reflect best available research and practice in teaching and learning. The plan must focus on: **A.** the development, alignment*, and implementation of standards and standards-based assessments, **B.** individual school improvement goals and **C.** assessed needs based on documented student results. The plan was developed collaboratively with all constituent groups: administrators, staff, students, and parent/ community members.	Evidence is provided by the district to ensure that district/school and individual professional development plans are based on school improvement goals/results and contain focused, sustained (with follow up), effectively organized professional development activities that reflect best available research and practice in teaching and learning. The plans must focus on: **D.** the development, alignment*, and implementation of standards and standards-based assessments, **E.** individual school improvement goals, and **F.** assessed needs based on documented student results.	Evidence is provided by the district to ensure that district and school professional development plans are based on school improvement goals. The plans are missing one or more of the focus components referenced in A-C.	No evidence of professional development planning is provided by the district.		[redacted]
* Alignment may be directed to either state standards and/or grade/course level, including instructional units.						

Criteria	Scoring Guide				Self-Assess Scores	WDE Scores
	4	3	2	1		
Deployment	The district/schools provide evidence that the district/school and individual professional development plans (as described in approach 3) which are based on school improvement goals/results are **G.** implemented, **H.** sustained (with follow up), **I.** focused, **J.** results-oriented, **K.** supported by substantial time and other resources, **L.** meeting the timeliness in the plans, and **M.** utilizing a variety of professional development formats (i.e., study groups, peer coaching and mentoring, peer observations, networking, further exploration/ discussions, follow up trainings) Evidence is provided that the district/school and individual professional development plans have been monitored and documented adjustments have been made in all plans. Professional development has become an integrated part of the ongoing school climate resulting in cultural change in the district/schools.	The district/schools provide evidence that the district/school and individual professional development plans (as described in approach 3) which are based on school improvement goals/results are **N.** implemented, **O.** sustained (with follow up), **P.** focused, **Q.** results-oriented **R.** supported by substantial time and other resources, **S.** meeting the timeliness in the plans, and **T.** utilizing a variety of professional development formats (i.e., study groups, peer coaching and mentoring, peer observations, networking, further exploration/discussions, follow up trainings, etc.)	The district/schools provide evidence that the districts/schools and individual professional development plans (as described in approach 3) which are based on school improvement goals are **U.** implemented; however, one or more of the criteria referenced in **G-L** are missing.	No documented evidence is provided that the district/school and individual professional development plans which are based on school improvement goals are implemented.		

Criteria	Scoring Guide				Self-Assess Scores	WDE Scores
	4	3	2	1		
Results	The district/schools can document* that professional development programs/initiatives have: **J.** impacted the majority of educators' knowledge and skills, **K.** become practice for a majority of educators, and **L.** improved student achievement**	The district/schools can document* that professional development programs/initiatives have: **M.** impacted the majority of educators' knowledge and skills, and **N.** resulted in continuous implementation for a majority of educators	The district /schools can document* that professional development programs/initiatives have impacted educators' knowledge and skills.	No documented evidence that professional development programs/ initiatives have impacted educators' knowledge and skills.		

*Teacher survey, administrative observation records, peer observation documentation, student survey

**Assessment results (CRT/NRT/WyCAS); portfolio evaluations, teacher grades, school attendance, classroom behaviors (affective goals), graduation rates, enrollment in advanced courses, etc.

APPENDIX C: EXCERPT FROM NEBRASKA STAFF DEVELOPMENT POLICY

The State Board of Education believes effective local staff development:

❒ Expands the knowledge and skills of educators and policy makers resulting in improved learning opportunities for all students.

- Reflects successful teaching and student learning practices
- Focuses on the classroom.
- Is ongoing and continuous.
- Provides time for staff to acquire new knowledge and skills.
- Includes a description of incentives used to encourage staff involvement.

❒ Is implemented through a partnership at the building, district, regional (educational service unit) and state levels and is focused on district/teacher needs.

- Is part of comprehensive planning for school improvement including a supportive
- organizational environment.
- Assesses district needs in State Board priority areas.
- Includes parent input on school needs.

❒ Utilizes evaluation data to improve program activities.

- Provides public awareness of purposes and results of program.

It is the intent of the State Board of Education to provide leadership and support for effective staff development through directing the Department of Education to:

- Work in **partnership** with educational service units in the development of the core services statewide professional development system which will assist local districts in implementation of standards and assessment.
- Provide **resources and opportunities** for schools in developing effective staff development practice.
- Disseminate **successful** staff development practices.
- Utilize **technology** in delivering staff development.
- **Coordinate** preservice and inservice programming.
- Identify **funding sources** available to establish model programs.
- Disseminate curriculum **frameworks and guidelines** for best practice that Identify teacher knowledge and skills needed for effective district implementation of standards and other content areas.

APPENDIX D: MISSOURI SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROCESS — STANDARD 6.7

Professional development is an integral part of the educational program and all school improvement initiatives.

Staff development initiatives are long-term and include follow-up, coaching, and evaluation activities; these activities address issues directly related to student achievement; and, evidence suggests that all faculty members are involved in professional development activities. Professional development activities provide opportunities for teachers and administrators to work together to enhance their professional skills. Specific instructional strategies have been focused on in the professional development program. Professional development activities are clearly related to goals in the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan. Professional development activities have been evaluated in terms of their impact on improving student achievement. A written procedural professional development plan, which meets all legal requirements, is in place. Adequate time and resources for professional development are provided.

Source: Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2000). *Missouri School Improvement Program: Third Cycle Procedures Handbook, 2001–02* (p. 26). Jefferson City, MO: Author. Retrieved November 1, 2001, from ftp://www.dese.state.mo.us/pub/ divimprove/sia/msip/ thirdcycleprocedureshandbook.doc

.....

Schools in the third cycle of the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) are provided with guidance on the types of documentation and written response they need to make.

Indicators 1 & 3. Written Response Required

[Complete the following chart by describing the main issues addressed through any of the listed professional development structures/activities.]

Type of Professional Activity	Topic/Focus/Content
❒ Study Group Groups of educators focus on different aspects of a particular curricular or instructional issue, share findings, and make recommendations.	
❒ Action Research Group Collection and analysis of data for a particular instructional issue, determination of a plan of action, based on literature available, and documentation of results.	
❒ Design Team Team designs a plan for staff development activities that address a specific instructional need.	

❒ Peer Coaching Teachers who have participated in specific professional development activities offer constructive suggestions to others while implementing related instructional/curricular improvements.	
❒ Teacher Collaboratives Groups of educators organized around a common topic of interest who provide support and facilitate learning for each other.	
❒ Academics (district-sponsored) Formal postsecondary professional activities for which credit is awarded.	
❒ Video-taped Lessons (for self-appraisal)	
❒ Reflective Journals/Reflective Practices Reflective journals: A method of gathering information regarding teachers' cognitive learning about new instructional processes and practices. Reflective practices: Deliberate and sustained reflection and action around a particular instructional issue.	
Portfolio Management/Portfolio of Teaching Strategies Documentation of work in the area of staff development that reflects teachers' efforts and results with new instructional processes and organizational change.	

[No more than a two-page response/summary (total) should be provided for the following statements.]

Describe the long-term focus that has been selected for the district's professional development program during the next 2–3 years.

Explain how this specific focus for the professional development program addresses issues related to student performance or results from the long-range planning process (CSIP).

Describe the three to four instructional strategies that the district has selected and focus on throughout the district in order to most effectively help students learn. List the specific instructional strategies and accompanying staff development activities (conducted or planned) that have been chosen with this long-term focus in mind and the percentage of staff involved in each activity.

In addition, explain what professional development, support programs, coaching activities, or other follow-up activities have been provided for teachers as they implement these districtwide instructional strategies and include the percent of teachers at each grade span that have participated in each of these professional development/support activities. Asterisk those activities that have already taken place at the time of the review.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PERCENT PARTICIPATION/	SUPPORT ACTIVITIES (E)	(MS)	(HS)
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

Documentation Required: CSIP

Indicator 2. Written Response Optional
Documentation: None

Indicator 4. Written Response Required
[No more than a one-page response/summary (total) should be provided for the following statements.]

- Describe what effect your professional development program has had on improving instruction and student achievement.
- Explain how successful this program has been, how the district has determined this, and cite any evidence the district has to support its conclusion.
-

Documentation Required: Results of most recent professional development program evaluation

Indicator 5. Written Response Optional

Documentation Required: Professional development policies, procedures, and procedural plan
District's annul audit or annual Secretary of the Board's report

Source: Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2000, August). *Missouri School Improvement Program: District Response to the Standards for MSIP Reviews in 2001–2002* (pp. 10–12). Jefferson City, MO: Author. Retrieved November 15, 2001, from ftp://www.dese.state.mo.us/pub/divimprove/sia/msip/districtresponse.doc

APPENDIX E: KANSAS CONTINUUM OF EFFECTIVE RESULTS-BASED STAFF DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES

Staff Development Continuum

Moving From	Building Toward
Opportunities	Responsibilities
Rewarding inputs	Rewarding results
Expectations: you might want to go; responsibility to grow (an obligation)	Expectations: It is your professional (primarily an opportunity)
Individual focus	Equal focus on the individual, building (school improvement), and the district (organizational development)
Staff wishes	Student needs
Focus on good things to do (multiple wants)	Prioritization based on the needs of students
Decisions based on "gut-level" feelings	Decisions based on the needs of students
Many ideas, superficially addressed	Doing one thing right before moving on to the next
Reactive to change	Proactive — paradigm pioneers
Staff development primarily as going to a workshop or conference	Staff development beginning at a workshop, conference, or school site – but – follow-up leading to implementation at the school site
Evaluation based on attendance and satisfaction with the workshop	Assessment based on what difference it makes for students
Using evaluation at the end of an activity as a signal that "we're through"	Using evaluation as a feedback loop to assess progress toward goal completion, to make decisions whether to retrain, stop training, or move on to a new goal
Expertise exists primarily outside our school	Building expertise among our staff
Awareness (motivation, inspiration, & gains in knowledge)	Skill attainment (implementation leading to student success)
Accountability: individuals elect for (if they feel like it, voluntary)	Accountability: individuals may elect themselves, but individuals cannot opt out of the school improvement plan goals or district development efforts
Passive participants in learning	Active partners in the staff development process
Resource allocation based on how little or much we want to spend	Resource allocation based on what needs to happen

Source: Results-based Staff Development, Kansas State Department of Education, 1998. Retrieved November 8, 2001, from http://www.ksbe.state.ks.us/Welcome.html